

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doron (US 6,559,888) in view of Nishimoto (JP 2001-051183 A) in view of Ohara (JP 61-045684). Claim 3 has been canceled.

Amended claim 1 requires the output of an electrically enlarged recorded image during a transition time period of a magnification converting lens being inserted onto an optical axis. As noted in the Office action, Doron does not disclose the claimed magnification converting lens, and the combination of Doron and Nishimoto do not teach outputting a recorded image during the claimed transition time period.

Ohara is cited for teaching outputting a stored image during the transition time period of the magnification converting lens being inserted onto the optical axis. However, Ohara does not teach to output an electrically enlarged recorded image during the transition time period. As can be seen in Fig. 2(e), Ohara outputs a signal from image memory between times t_a and t_d that is equal to the image signal at or immediately prior to t_a . Therefore, the image output between times t_a and t_d has been recorded, but has not been electrically enlarged.

Doron teaches digital zooming, but does not suggest digital zooming during the claimed transition time period. According to both Nishimoto and Ohara, the *magnification after insertion* of the magnification converting lens *is the same as the magnification before insertion*. At best, the cited combination of references might suggest an image pickup device in which the image magnification before insertion of the magnification converting lens is the same after insertion

thereof, and the image is electrically enlarged and outputted after insertion of the magnification converting lens. However, applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of references fails to teach, or otherwise render foreseeable, “wherein said signal processing circuit electronically enlarges the image recorded to said image recording section and *outputs the electrically enlarged image during a transition time period of said magnification converting lens being inserted onto said optical axis.*” In view of the differences between the subject matter of claim 1 and the cited references, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over said references. Claims 2 and 4-9 depend from claim 1. The arguments provided above with respect to claim 1 generally apply to claim 10.

Claims 4-8 further require that during the transition time period of the magnification converting lens being inserted onto said optical axis, the signal processing circuit stepwise enlarges the image recorded to the image recording section. The cited combination of references does not teach stepwise enlarging a recorded image during the claimed transition period of the magnification converting lens. For this additional reason, claims 4-8 are allowable over the cited combination of references.

New claims 11 and 12 have been added, which depend from claim 1.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.: OHNO-40226.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: 
Brad C. Spencer – Reg. No. 57,076

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: July 23, 2010